

Maureen C. VanderMay, WSBA No. 16742
 The VanderMay Law Firm PC
 2021 S. Jones Blvd.
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
 (702) 538-9300

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

ELF-MAN, LLC,)	Case No.: 2:13-CV-00395-TOR
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	REPLY MEMORANDUM IN
RYAN LAMBERSON,)	SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
Defendant.)	MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
)	DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED
)	ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE
)	DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFF'S
)	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
)	AND COUNTERCLAIM

Defendant has submitted a memorandum in opposition to Plaintiff's Motions in Response to Defendant's First Amended Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint; and Counterclaim. ECF No. 25. For the reasons set forth herein, Plaintiff submits that Defendant's positions are not well taken and that its motions should be granted.

Reply to "FACTS" Section (ECF No. 25 at pp. 1-5)

Before setting forth his legal arguments, Defendant includes five pages which consist of a diatribe concerning the status of discovery, references to actions purportedly taken by Quentin Tarantino and "Prince" Rogers Nelson, and other

REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
 PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
 DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER
 AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
 PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
 AND COUNTERCLAIM – Page 1

1 extraneous matter. *Id.* at pp. 1-5. The accompanying declaration of counsel
2 addresses the status of discovery and Defendant's unsubstantiated claims as to the
3 evidence of infringement in this case.

4 His introductory section also makes the untenable claim that because several
5 of the persons identified in Plaintiff's FRCP 26(a) Initial Disclosures have
6 addresses in Germany that the subject infringement is somehow "extraterritorial."
7 ECF No. 25 at pp. 2-3. Defendant cites to *Subafilms LTD v. MGM-Pathe*
8 *Communications, Inc.*, 24 F.3d 1088, 1094 (9th Cir. 1994), in support of his
9 position. This decision's discussion of extraterritorial infringement is inapposite.
10 The infringement at issue in this action did not occur in Germany. As Plaintiff's
11 First Amended Complaint alleges, it occurred within this judicial district through
12 the IP address assigned to Defendant by Comcast, his U.S. ISP. ECF No. 3 at p.
13 11, ¶¶ 80-83 Defendant's argument based on the address of Plaintiff's witnesses
14 is specious.

15 Defendant is equally misguided in claiming that Plaintiff lacks standing to
16 pursue this action, citing to the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Righthaven, LLC v.*
17 *Hoehn*, 716 F.3d 1166, 1169 (9th Cir. 2013). ECF No. 25 at pp. 3-4. He cites to a
18 complaint filed in another district by other counsel on behalf of Vision Films, Inc.,
19 Plaintiff's sales agent with respect to *Elf-Man*. *Id.* Because Plaintiff is the
20 registered owner of the copyright to this motion picture, see First Amended
21 Complaint, ECF No. 3 at p. 4, ¶ 16, under *Righthaven*, Plaintiff has standing to
22 bring this action in a district within the Ninth Circuit. In *Righthaven*, the Ninth
23 Circuit concluded that an assignee granted limited rights with respect to copyright

24
25
26
27
28
REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER
AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
AND COUNTERCLAIM – Page 2

1 enforcement lacked standing to assert the subject claim for infringement. As such,
2 depending on the terms of any assignment, if this action were brought by an
3 assignee of Plaintiff's rights that party might not have standing under *Righthaven*.
4 As the registered owner of the copyright at issue, nothing in *Righthaven* calls
5 Plaintiff's standing into question. Of course, whether Vision Films, Inc. has
6 standing to bring an action in the Eastern District of Tennessee pursuant to Sixth
7 Circuit law is for Vision Films, Inc., its counsel and, ultimately, that tribunal to
8 determine.

9 Lastly, this section claims that Defendant has proffered a proposed second
10 amended answer "which expressly addresses each issue raised by plaintiff's
11 motion." ECF No. 25 at p. 5. This statement is inaccurate. Defendant's proposed
12 second amended answer would remedy some but by no means all of the defects of
13 his first amended answer. Moreover, as explained in Plaintiff's memorandum in
14 opposition to Defendant's motion to file a second amended answer, Defendant's
15 explanations as to why he seeks to withdraw his first amended answer does not
16 withstand scrutiny. ECF No. 24 at pp. 2-4. It is clear that he seeks to withdraw
17 his ill conceived state law claims in order to avoid an adverse ruling.

18 **Reply to "LEGAL ARGUMENT" Section (ECF No. 25 at pp. 6-20)**

19 **I Plaintiffs Special Motion to Strike Defendant's State Law**
20 **Counterclaims Should be Granted.**

21 Relying upon a law review article and a decision construing California's
22 anti-SLAPP statute, Defendant argues that his state law counterclaims do not
23
24

25 REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
26 PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
27 DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER
28 AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
AND COUNTERCLAIM – Page 3

1 constitute SLAPP claims.¹ ECF No. 25 at p. 6. This ignores the clear and
 2 unequivocal language of the Washington statute, which includes the following in
 3 its definition of "action involving public participation and petition:

4 "(a) Any oral statement made, or *written statement or other document*
 5 *submitted*, in a legislative, executive, or *judicial proceeding* or other
 governmental proceeding authorized by law;

6 "(b) Any oral statement made, or *written statement or other document*
 7 *submitted, in connection with an issue under consideration or review*
 by a legislative, executive, or *judicial proceeding* or other
 8 governmental proceeding authorized by law;"

9 RCW 4.25.525(2) (emphasis added).

10 Although Defendant now argues that his counterclaims "are based on
 11 plaintiff's entire unlawful business scheme" and not merely on this litigation, ECF
 12 No. 25 at p. 6, his counterclaims are not so stated in his first amended answer. His
 13 purported factual basis for each state law counterclaim is based on actions taken or

14
 15 ¹While decisions construing California's anti-SLAPP legislation can be
 16 useful in construing the Washington statute, this Court has cautioned that because
 17 the statutes are not identical the citation of California decisions as persuasive
 18 authority must take account of these differences. *See Jones v. City of Yakima*
 19 *Police Dep't.*, Case No. 12-CV-3005-TOR at p. 3 (E.D. Wash., May 24, 2012) (a
 20 copy of which is attached to Plaintiff's motions in response to Defendant's first
 21 amended answer, ECF No. 20, as Attachment 1).

22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000

1 allegedly taken in this litigation or in unidentified statements made in conjunction
2 with this action. *See* Plaintiff's motions in response to this pleading, ECF No. 20
3 at pp. 5-7. His gloss on decisional law from the Western District of Washington
4 and California regarding the Washington act, ECF No. 25 at pp. 7-8, does not
5 trump the fact that his retaliatory counterclaims fall within the express terms of
6 RCW 4.25.525(2).

7 Defendant recognizes that under RCW 4.24.525 upon a showing that claims
8 are subject to the Act's terms, the burden shifts to the moving party to show a
9 probability of prevailing. ECF No. 25 at p. 8. He then claims that he
10 "demonstrates a probability of prevailing on his counterclaims, *infra*." *Id.*
11 Defendant, of course, has made no such showing. Indeed, on the first business day
12 after the filing of Plaintiff's RCW 4.24.525 motion, he moved for leave to file an
13 amended pleading which withdraws all of his state law counterclaims. ECF No.
14 21. He has not addressed the merits of these claims and, as such, has made no
15 showing whatsoever that he had even a remote chance of prevailing on the subject
16 counterclaims.

17 Even a cursory review of Defendant's state law counterclaim refutes his
18 argument that applying RCW 4.24.525 would be absurd. As explained in
19 Plaintiff's motions, ECF No. 20 at pp.5-7, each of these claims seeks recourse for
20 actions taken in this litigation or incident thereto. There is nothing absurd about
21 Plaintiff moving to strike counterclaims which on their face seek to retaliate
22 against it for its petitioning this Court for redress resulting from the infringement
23 of its copyright.

24
25 REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
26 PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
27 DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER
28 AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
AND COUNTERCLAIM – Page 5

1 Defendant's assertion that Plaintiff's special motion to strike is moot also
2 lacks merit. ECF No. 25 at p. 9. After claiming on the one hand that the motion is
3 moot because he seeks to withdraw the subject counterclaims, he then purports to
4 reserve "the right to re-instate a CPA claim depending on the resolution of the
5 motion." Defendant chose to assert these ill conceived counterclaims, which
6 required Plaintiff's counsel to expend a considerable amount of time fashioning a
7 response, now seeks to withdraw these claims while attempting to retain the right
8 to re-file some or all of them. Such machinations should not be countenanced.

9 **II Defendant's Counterclaims for Declaratory Relief Should Be Dismissed.**

10 With respect to his counterclaim seeking a declaration of non-infringement,
11 Defendant ignores the fact that this claim is redundant and the mirror image of
12 Plaintiff's claim for copyright infringement. He also ignores fundamental
13 principles of claim and issue preclusion, arguing that after this matter is resolved
14 he could face claims by other parties for the subject infringement. ECF No. 25 at
15 p. 10. Similarly, he ignores the fact that his claim for a declaration of copyright
16 misuse constitutes an affirmative defense and not a claim for relief. *Id.* None of
17 these positions are well taken for the reasons set forth in Plaintiff's motions, ECF
18 No. 20 at pp. 10-11.

19 With respect to his Count 3, Defendant's arguments are based on his
20 proposed second amended answer. ECF No. 25 at pp. 10-11. As of this date, he
21 has not been granted leave to file this pleading and Plaintiff's motions concern his
22 first amended answer. Because his attempted fix of this count is flawed, Plaintiff
23 will address this issue in the event that the Court grants Defendant leave to file a

24
25
26
27
28
REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER
AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
AND COUNTERCLAIM – Page 6

1 second amended answer. Defendant fails to address Plaintiff's position that Count
2 3 should be dismissed under the prudential doctrine of primary jurisdiction. ECF
3 No. 20 at p. 11.

4 With respect to his state law counterclaims, Defendant simply rehashes his
5 untenable explanation as to why he seeks to drop these claims. ECF No. 25 at p.
6 11. He previously addressed this issue in his motion for leave to file a second
7 amended answer, ECF No. 21 at p. 5, and Plaintiff has addressed this issue in its
8 response to that motion, ECF No. 24 at pp. 5-6. In short, Defendant claims that
9 two of his state law counterclaims are moot because he has terminated his
10 relationship with Comcast. He still fails to explain how this termination renders
11 these claims moot if in fact he had a good faith basis for alleging them in the first
12 place.

13 With respect to his counterclaim for alleged violation of Washington's
14 Consumer Protection Act, Defendant asserts that he seeks to drop it "for
15 convenience of the present procedural posture." ECF No. 25 at p. 11. In all
16 candor, Plaintiff cannot respond to this because it does not understand what
17 Defendant is asserting.

18 Lastly with respect to Plaintiff's motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P.
19 12(b)(6), Defendant argues that the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine is inapplicable
20 because he "has brought no antitrust counterclaims." ECF No. 25 at p. 12. As
21 noted in Plaintiff's motions, this doctrine has been extended beyond the antitrust
22 context and, indeed, applied by the Ninth Circuit to circumstances substantially
23 analogous to those at issue here. *See* ECF No. 20 at pp. 8-9 (discussing *Sosa v.*

24
25
26
27
28
REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER
AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
AND COUNTERCLAIM – Page 7

1 *DirecTV, Inc.*, 437 F.3d 923 (9th Cir. 2006).

2 **III Defendant's First Amended Answer Alleges Fraud and Fails to Plead**
3 **These Allegations with Sufficient Particularity**

4 Although his first amended answer is replete with allegations that Plaintiff
5 is engaged in some sort of fraudulent enterprise, Defendant fails to state his
6 affirmative defenses and counterclaims based on such allegations with the
7 particularity required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). While his responsive pleading
8 contains several lengthy narratives and voluminous attachments, he fails to
9 identify what portion of these materials relate to any given counterclaim or
10 affirmative defense. As such, even if the Court declines to strike this material, it
11 fails to amount to the pleading with particularity required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b).

12 **IV Plaintiff's Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) Motion Should Be Granted**

13 Defendant asserts that he is "entitled to allege his affirmative defenses
14 on information and belief." ECF No. 25 at p. 13. This does not, of course, afford
15 him license to file a pleading in contravention of the Federal Rules of Civil
16 Procedure that is replete with extraneous and irrelevant material. It also does not
17 allow him to file massive responsive pleadings which attempt to circumvent the
18 Federal Rules of Evidence by proffering numerous documents and baseless factual
19 assertions, presumably in an effort to sway the trier of fact with material which is
20 either legally irrelevant, inadmissible, or both. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
21 8(b)(1) mandates that Defendant "state in short and plain terms its defenses to each
22 claim asserted against it" Defendant has failed to comply with this
23 requirement.

24
25
26
27
28
REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER
AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
AND COUNTERCLAIM – Page 8

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully submits that its motions in response to Defendant's first amended answer should be granted.

DATED: February 21, 2014

The VanderMay Law Firm

s/ Maureen C. VanderMay
Maureen C. VanderMay, WSBA No. 16742
Email: elfmanwa@vandermaylawfirm.com
2021 S Jones Blvd.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
(702) 538-9300
Of Attorneys for Plaintiff

REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER
AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT;
AND COUNTERCLAIM – Page 9